



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/025,183	12/19/2001	Jeffrey A. Von Arx	279.391US1	6387
21186	7590	02/15/2006	EXAMINER	
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH 1600 TCF TOWER 121 SOUTH EIGHT STREET MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			MANUEL, GEORGE C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3762	

DATE MAILED: 02/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/025,183

Applicant(s)

VON ARX ET AL.

Examiner

George Manuel

Art Unit

3762

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-46 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraus et al '559.

Kraus et al disclose an implantable medical device comprising a near field antenna 47 and a far field antenna 49. See Fig. 7. Kraus et al further teach the electro-medical implant may comprise a telemetry device for the exchange of data with an external apparatus to a cardiac pacemaker comprising the telemetry having both the near field antenna and the far field antenna.

Regarding claims 1 and 37, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it

Art Unit: 3762

obvious to inductively couple the close-range antenna 47 because inductive field antennae are easy to manufacture and inexpensive and offer limited field strength.

Regarding claims 3-7, col. 6, lines 60-63 teach the antenna can be a simple wire loop or an open wire. In view of this teaching, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to provide a coil, dipole, monopole, a conductor of a lead, or a circumferential antenna for the medical device because these configurations are mere extensions of a wire loop or an open wire.

Regarding claim 13, the examiner is interpreting an external coil to comprise antenna 15 connected to a programmer comprising external apparatus 2.

Regarding claims 17-20, 23-25 and 28 the examiner is interpreting the adaptation of the modulation programming for a respective telemetry to be met using matching logic unit 50 connected to the telemetry unit 45.

Regarding claim 21, the examiner is interpreting switching unit 46.1 to comprise a device to select one of the wireless transmitter for transmitting an outbound signal.

Regarding claims 26 and 27, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to decode data received and store data in the memory of the implantable device based on an inbound signal because Kraus et al teach device 7 can transmit data which are read out of the implant by way of a first interface device 6 in any suitable format.

Regarding claim 36, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to

Art Unit: 3762


store data in memory in the implanted device and operate the device based on the memory because the pacemaker would not be proximate to a programmable source for extended periods of time when the patient is mobile.

Regarding claim 41, col. 5, lines 14-15 teach a key may be used for sending short messages to a service center to test a SMS channel. One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to power the far field antenna 49 after receiving a far field key signal because starting a test requires similar antenna initiation as powering a transmitter.

Regarding claims 43-45, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to continuously power the far field receiver after receiving a suspend duty cycle signal because switching unit 46.1 is capable of switching between either the long-range or the close-range antennae and separate energy storage means 51 and 52 allow for the continuous powering when triggered by a key to suspend the duty cycle.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George Manuel whose telephone number is (571) 272-4952.


George Manuel
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 3762

2/10/06